

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PRAKASH MELWANI,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C21-1329RSM

ORDER DENYING STIPULATED
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' Model Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #78.¹ The Court finds that the proposed Protective Order does not conform to the requirement that its "protection from public disclosure and use extends only to the limited information or items that are entitled to confidential treatment under the applicable legal principles" as stated by Local Rule 26(c)(2). Under the section entitled Confidential Material, the Court's model protective order instructs: "[t]he parties must include a list of specific documents such as 'company's customer list' or 'plaintiff's medical records;' do not list broad categories of documents such as 'sensitive business material.'" The parties have not included a list of specific documents and instead state only: "'Confidential' material shall include

¹ The Court notes that the parties have not filed this as a stipulated motion. Instead, they have filed only a proposed order. If the parties seek a protective order signed by the Court, they are to file a stipulated motion with an attached proposed order and an attached redline version.

1 information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that
2 qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).” Dkt. #78 at 2.

3 The Court finds that the parties have impermissibly left the door open to labeling a wide
4 variety of documents as confidential, without any list of specific documents. The parties know
5 what kinds of documents are at issue in this case and need not be this broad. The parties submit
6 no argument to justify this departure from the model protective order’s guidelines. Accordingly,
7 this Motion will be denied.
8

9 Having reviewed the briefing, along with the remainder of the record, the Court hereby
10 finds and ORDERS that the parties’ Model Stipulated Protective Order, Dkt. #78, is DENIED.

11 DATED this 19th day of July, 2023.

12
13 

14 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27